ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.	DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW
ED001129	N.A.	CR F-013	

4. AUTHOR(S):
Sowards, G. Wesley

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:
A Working Seminar on the Improvement of the Social Studies Curriculum

6. PUBLICATION TITLE:
N.A.

7. EDITOR(S):
N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. School of Edu.
ST. Stanford U.
CITY, STATE Stanford, Cal.
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE Cooperative Research Program, Office of Education, Dept. of HEW, Washington, D.C.

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	63	30

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR
REPORT

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

teacher edu.	social sciences	units of study	
curriculum	child development	curriculum improvement	
social studies	teaching plans	teaching techniques	

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

The possibilities of expanding or condensing the social studies curriculums in public schools was discussed. A one week seminar considered the following: the part of social studies in school curriculum, satisfaction with present practices, public reluctance to allow social studies to deal with social reality and the extent to which this acts as an obstacle to curriculum, the need for improved and new instructional materials, the education of teachers, curriculum design, research need, problems of priority, and feasibility of accomplishing these improvements.

It was concluded that goal-agreement was of utmost importance. Research and development projects are listed and discussed as well as teacher education and financial support.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OR PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

ED001129

A WORKING SEMINAR ON THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROJECT NO. F-013

C. WESLEY SOWARDS

REPRINTED BY PERMISSION
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PRINTED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

A WORKING SEMINAR ON THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM

Cooperative Research Project No. F-013

G. Wesley Sowards

Stanford University
Stanford, California

1963

The research reported herein was supported by
the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education,
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Problem and Objectives		1
Procedure		3
Work Session One:	The Social Studies as a Strand in the Curriculum	6
Work Session Two:	Developing and Implementing Teaching Plans in the Social Studies	10
Work Session Three:	Overall Curriculum Planning for the Social Studies	13
Work Session Four:	Overall Curriculum Planning for the Social Studies (cont.)	17
Work Session Five:	Development of Provisional Reports of Recommendations	20
Work Session Six:	Conclusions and Suggestions for Action	21

PROBLEM AND OBJECTIVES

1. Problem. Public school educators and social scientists alike are increasingly concerned with the improvement of the social studies curriculum in the elementary and secondary schools of this country. Their concerns are manifest in such promising developments as (1) the organization of the several task force groups each working on one specific social science discipline under auspices of the parent professional association, e.g., the American Economic Association; the American Association of Geographers and National Council of Geographic Education; the American Anthropological Association, and others; (2) the readiness of the National Science Foundation to support projects aimed at course content improvement in the social studies; (3) the publication entitled The Social Sciences and the Social Studies sponsored jointly by the American Council of Learned Societies and the National Council for the Social Studies. Foremost among these expressions of concern is Project Social Studies of the United States Office of Education.

It seems clear that these efforts will gain in force and that additional efforts will undoubtedly be made. The period just ahead gives promise of improvement in the social studies unknown for the past twenty-five years. It is out of this setting that the plans for this working-seminar developed. During this week together this group attempted to identify important matters which demand attention if the social studies curriculum is to be improved, and to suggest courses of action for attacking them. Such an effort will provide guidance to the development of needed projects in this area by indicating a sense of urgency and priority for action.

2. Objectives. Specifically, this small working-seminar met for a one-week period to consider:

(1) the extent of agreement which exists with respect to the educational purposes for which the social studies are to be held accountable as a part of the school curriculum.

(2) satisfaction with present practices in accomplishing agreed upon purposes.

(3) the extent to which public reluctance to allow the social studies to deal generally with social reality exists, and the extent to which this acts as an obstacle to curriculum improvement.

(4) the need for improved and new materials of instruction for use in the classroom.

(5) the education of teachers for the social studies.

(6) the problem of curriculum design (content and process dimensions) in the social studies.

(7) research that must be undertaken to produce needed new knowledge.

(8) unique or peculiar problems of design and methodology that are evident in the kinds of research which need to be undertaken.

(9) some order of priority in the totality of enterprises considered important.

(10) the feasibility of accomplishing these enterprises in relation to necessary participants and essential finances.

PROCEDURE

In order to accomplish the listed objectives, twenty outstanding persons, including ten social scientists and ten social studies educators, were invited to spend the week of July 15 at Stanford University as a working-seminar group. Those in attendance were:

Harry Alpert
Professor of Sociology
Department of Sociology
University of Oregon

Carleton Coon
Anthropologist
207 Concord Street
Gloucester, Massachusetts

Jean Fair
Professor of Education
College of Education
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan

M. L. Frankel
Director
Joint Council on Economic Education
2 West 46th Street
New York 36, New York

Dorothy M. Fraser
Professor of Education
Department of Social Studies
Hunter College
New York, New York

Merrill Hartshorn
Executive Secretary
National Council for the Social Studies
1201 - 16th Street
Washington 6, D. C.

Emlyn Jones
Professor of History and Education
Department of Education
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Clyde Kohn
Professor of Geography
Department of Geography
State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Lawrence Metcalf
Professor of Education
College of Education
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

John Michaelis
Professor of Education
School of Education
University of California
Berkeley, California

Peter Odegard
Professor of Political Science
Department of Political Science
University of California
Berkeley, California

Franklin Patterson
Director
Lincoln Filene Center
Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts

William Pattison
Professor of Geography
Department of Geography
University of California
at Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California

David M. Potter
Coe Professor of History
Department of History
Stanford University
Stanford, California

Ralph Preston
Professor of Education
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Roy Price
Professor of Education
Maxwell School of
Citizenship Education
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Cora Prifold
American Political Science
Association
1726 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C.

Hilda Taba
Professor of Education
Division of Education
San Francisco State College
San Francisco, California

Lawrence Senesh
Professor of Economics
Department of Economics
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana

Paul L. Ward
President
Sarah Lawrence College
Bronxville, New York

Participants from the faculty of the School of Education, Stanford University, were:

Professor G. Wesley Sowards, Seminar Director
Professor Paul R. Hanna, Special Consultant to the Seminar
Professor Richard E. Gross, Special Consultant to the Seminar
Professor Dwight Allen, Special Consultant to the Seminar

Recent and important writings on the social sciences and/or the social studies of each seminar member were solicited and circulated as a study portfolio prior to the meeting week. Accompanying this was a request for each seminar member to come prepared to discuss matters related to the above stated objectives. Formal papers were not requested in keeping with the "working" setting envisioned for the week.

The plan called for this seminar group to meet all day on Monday, Tuesday, and Friday of the week of July 15. The annual Cubberley Conference on Education for 1963 met on July 17 and 18 and was focused on the theme: The Social Studies - Curriculum Proposals for the Future. Participants in this conference were to be State Department of Education personnel, social scientists from Western colleges and universities, and staff from selected county and local school districts from across the country. Discussion focused on the conference theme was to be accomplished in small groups made up of these three types of participants, stimulated by a series of formal papers consistent with the conference theme. On these two days (July 17 and 18) paired observers (a social scientist and a social studies educator) from the working-seminar were to sit with selected discussion groups from the Cubberley Conference. It was felt that by so doing the working-seminar would have the benefit not only of their own thinking but also of this large group of people interested in and/or responsible for leadership in the social studies as the seminar attempted on Friday to state a series of recommendations for action in this area.

Unfortunately, it was not possible to attract persons in the categories of State Department of Education personnel and college or university social scientists in sufficient numbers to form the ten anticipated special discussion groups. There were just nine people in attendance representing seven State Departments of Education, and four social scientists from four separate institutions of higher education in three different states. In light of this, just two special discussions groups were formed to be observed by seminar personnel. The

remainder of the seminar group was present at general sessions for the presentations of the formal papers to the Cubberley Conference and utilized the remainder of these two days for extended deliberations within the seminar itself.

The fact that it was not possible to attract more State Department of Education personnel and college and university social scientists to this conference may well constitute a particular sort of "finding" for this working-seminar. A truly national effort to improve the social studies curriculum calls for a cooperative effort among all parties mentioned earlier here. County and local district persons, about 250 of whom attended the conference, cannot do the job alone. Evidently some very special arrangements will have to be made if these other persons are to become involved in any number. The fact that it was possible to bring together the twenty outstanding persons for the working-seminar and to have enthusiastic and sincere deliberations together for a week would seem to indicate that it can be done.

WORK SESSION ONE

The first work session of the seminar was called to order at 9:30 a.m., on July 15, with Professor Paul R. Hanna in the chair. The general focus for this first session was: The Social Studies as a Strand in the Curriculum. These leading questions were posed to start the discussions:

(1) What do we accept as the social studies?

(2) What do we expect of the social studies?

(3) What should we expect of the social studies?

(4) Can we deal adequately with public reluctance to allow the social studies to deal with social reality?

The chairman called attention to the significant work already done in several other curriculum areas, notably science and mathematics, and indicated his pleasure in seeing the developing effort for attention to the social studies. Recent work by the National Council for the Social Studies in cooperation with the American Council of Learned Societies was noted. Support for work in the social studies by the National Science Foundation was illustrated by reference to the project joining the American Council of Learned Societies and Education Services Incorporated. This particular week-long working-seminar was cited as one of the first efforts supported by the new Project Social Studies of the United States Office of Education.

In so doing, the chairman made several references to the social sciences and history. In response to questions about this sort of differentiation, he called attention to the tendency of many to question the placement of history with the social sciences, and the specific way in which the National Science Foundation excluded history from the list of social science disciplines it could and would support financially. An historian in the group recognized the question in the minds of some as to whether history was a social science or one of the humanities, but did note that the Social Science Research Council includes history in its listings. Mention was also made of the new national Commission on the Humanities and the evidence that suggests that this commission hopes to embark upon projects in the social studies area.

This led to considerable discussion of the extent to which boundaries are important and necessary within knowledge. Some took the position that they would prefer to see the lines between areas of knowledge in the social sciences lessened, with at least one speaking out strongly for more concern over the essential unity of all knowledge and for attention to the relation of social science to natural science. Others felt that to diminish the lines of separation in the social sciences at this time would obscure some important aspects of social knowledge and would thus not be a wise thing. This seemed to lead to an acceptance by the group of some boundaries as being necessary and desirable at the scholar's level, but brought up questions of the importance of this separateness in elementary and secondary schools. More specifically, there was

discussion to the point of using all, or at least many, different social disciplines in relation to the study of important social matters. Questioning centered on the extent to which an attempt should be made to develop an amalgam of these when several were used, or the extent to which the integrity of each must be kept in mind and their boundaries made evident.

This seemed to shift the line of discussion to the use of the scientific method in social areas, and to ways of inquiring and knowing in these areas. Some felt that proper attention to the process-dimension would provide a way to cut across subject matter lines, or, put somewhat differently, would provide a bridge between these areas. One seminar member returned to some comments on the nature of history and the nature of historical knowledge. He raised the question of how you decide when you have knowledge, and underscored the importance of not accepting just facts as knowledge. His objective would be to turn out students competent in social analysis. Another commented on his own concern to help students to know what they know and how they know it--a focus on how we gain knowledge. Both agreed that particular historians used different approaches to historical knowledge and to that extent "divide down the middle" and contribute to the earlier references to the proper placement of history in the larger spectrum of organized knowledge.

Comments were then directed to the research efforts underway to identify key concepts in the social sciences, and to identify the structure of these particular fields of knowledge. Questions were raised as to whether or not the "structure" idea was workable in the social studies field. If there is a structure in each of these areas, how much of this approach could/should be used in the elementary and secondary school curriculum? If this approach is used, are we committed to deal with each area and its structure separately? And, if so, how many separate social subjects can we expect to have in the curriculum?

By this time the matter of "amalgam" or "separateness" was seen as a real issue. The chairman made reference to a conference of a few months ago centered essentially on improving the social studies in which it was very evident that each of the social sciences represented there seemed to want to dominate the curriculum. And still, it was argued that children and youth need the opportunity for a "holistic" view in the social studies as well as a chance to see and understand the several individual parts.

A comment at this point brought the seminar to a further consideration of things in addition to "higher levels of knowing" for the social studies. Concern was expressed that the historical commitment to citizenship education and to the development of behaviors and increased sensitiveness to "things social" not be lost sight of in pledges to training for social inquiry and analytical thinking.

The importance of the above was clearly recognized and discussion shifted to consider not just "coming down from the disciplines" to plan curriculum in the social studies, but to come at this planning task, too, from a social problem orientation. Clarification was sought between

a "problems approach" in the social studies and "problem solving" in the social studies. Most seemed to agree that children should not be asked to solve social problems in school. Most seemed to accept the value of a "sort of problems approach" that would focus on major social problems already met and solved in the main, addressing instruction to an analysis of "why did so and so do such and such, etc."

One discussant wondered why a certain social science discipline might not become a "lead motif" at certain times (for a particular year, or, even more specifically, for a particular problem or topic). Thus, the concern for experience in social analysis and with intellectual processes could retain a position of joint importance, and at the same time pupils would learn to identify the individual discipline "parts" in the whole of the social studies. There was some support for this, tempered with a strong reminder as to the demand the "problems approach" puts on the teacher to be truly a learned person.

At this point the chairman, in the interest of time, turned the discussion to the matter of public reluctance to have the social studies deal with social reality. The above concern was not to be lost, however, and occupies a great deal of discussion time again later in the week.

One member indicated, at the outset, that he felt the school has made much of its own trouble in this area by keeping the real world out of the classroom to protect children. This brought agreement from some others that (1) schools in some communities do much more of a "real" job than in others, and (2) there is a sort of self-imposed censorship which teachers often put on themselves which results in a reluctance to try to test limits, and to utilize new curricula.

Another called attention to the need for a "community education program" along with efforts to change the curriculum to do different things in the social studies. He cited the experience of the Joint Council for Economic Education in this area. It was mentioned that the introduction of new materials often appears to the public to be dealing with social change. This, then, introduces some conflict between the public's expected role for the school, namely the transmission of known social knowledge, and what looms as an unexpected role, namely the analysis of social problems. Attention was called again to the help and support which teachers will need if we expect much change in this area. As one discussant said, "They must not be left out on the edge alone." It was felt that "leverages" would have to be found which would help us to deal with social reality in the classroom, and the hope was expressed that somehow the power of the community of scholars might be used as one source of validation for things which should be dealt with. A comment was made that perhaps the "national" dimension in curriculum improvement work in the social studies might best be the identification and defense of essential conceptual material from the social sciences for the school curriculum by respected professional groups, with the "local" task becoming one of selecting and developing illustrative materials out of the more local setting which would provide the vehicle for getting at a rather common body of content. Again, the desired approach would be through the process of analysis as opposed to exhortation, and this in and of itself should lend some assurance to the public.

Concern was raised again as to whether or not we should aspire to study major current, complex social problems in the school and an obvious division of opinion existed on this. Some would use current situations only as motivational "launching pads" from which to move to a more abstract analysis of the phenomenon. It seemed to them that to do otherwise would unwisely "mire" the social studies in citizenship education. Others wanted to make sure that citizenship education was retained as a major focus and urged those feeling otherwise to remember that exhortation is not the only approach to citizenship education.

Two other members reminded the seminar persuasively that there is no single public, but a cluster of publics--with various motives, values, levels of information, and so on. Recognition of this "differentiated information market" raised the question as to the kind and extent of social information really needed by the public(s). Are we to plan a curriculum that will make "little" social scientists of everybody? Are we to plan a curriculum that will make "big" social scientists of nobody? On that note, Work Session One adjourned.

WORK SESSION TWO

Work Session Two was called to order at 1:30 p.m., July 15, by the session chairman, Professor Hilda Taba. The general focus for the afternoon was to be: Developing and Implementing Teaching Plans in the Social Studies. Leading questions had been posed as follows:

(1) To what extent are these (teaching plans) shaped by purposes to be achieved?

(2) To what extent are these shaped by the social sciences themselves?

(3) To what extent are these shaped by learning theory?

The chairman opened with reference to these questions but indicated a desire to state them somewhat differently. Perhaps more to the point, she chose to raise two other related questions insofar as developing and implementing teaching plans are concerned:

(1) What do we do about/with knowledge, or content, or subject matter?

(2) What do we do about/with intellectual processes, or learning styles?

The chairman saw as a central challenge here our ability to find a way to deal with both of these as teaching plans are made, that is, a way to "wed" them--to deal with them together. She went on to indicate her feeling that it is important, obviously, to plan (or select) carefully that which we want to learn (the subject matter to be dealt with). But, it is also equally important to plan the way in which it is most likely to be learned (how we deal with subject matter). This, she felt, calls for carefully conceived and well executed "teaching strategies." Both content to be dealt with and experiences to be provided must be selected and organized with equal care.

The chairman went on to indicate a need to consider four types of learning goals for the social studies, each of which requires somewhat different strategies of learning and of teaching.

(1) Knowledge: facts, ideas, concepts to be attained.

(2) Thinking: the cognitive processes to be mastered.

(3) Sensitivities: attitudes and feelings to be developed.

(4) Skills: academic and interactional to be mastered as essential tools for learning, communication, and for control of human environment.

Attention was called to the fact that for balanced results all of these need to be considered and provided for in planning curriculum and

instruction. It was noted also that it is important to determine the particular strategy which is needed for the optimum achievement of each type of learning. Additionally, the necessity to determine not only what the particular function of each provided learning experience is, but also to appraise its capacity to serve multiple objectives was noted.

At this point, questions were raised about the determination of content to be dealt with. The chairman saw the basic task here as the selection and formulation of the basic ideas (generalizations) in a subject matter area. These were seen to represent the "fundamentals", so to speak, of a discipline. They must be valid and significant (and therefore selected with the help of scholars from the disciplines) and learnable (and therefore selected with the help of curriculum makers and experienced teachers). These basic ideas represent essential knowledge, that is, the knowledge that all students should master.

At this point, the discussion shifted to the problem of making abstractions in the social sciences operational (visible, sensed), noting that this was much simpler in the natural sciences. Some exception was taken to this, with the feeling expressed that many "social things" can be observed readily in life around us. Perhaps, it was said, the task is to conceptualize what we see all around us, and to analyze that which we see. (Example used was the observation of the concept "division of labor" in the building of a house.) There was some agreement that much that is "social" can be seen (re: the example), but the question was raised as to what it all means to a child. One discussant asked, "Do we just stay with what is, or do we get into whys and values?" This seemed important to do to several seminar members. They reasoned that we live in a society which maximizes opportunities for the individual person to make decisions. Therefore, valuing, to them, becomes an important matter; human goals and purposes of paramount concern.

The point was then raised as to whether or not the method of analysis which many in the group seemed to want to teach would meet the concern of people to teach values, and valuing. One seminar member was particularly concerned about what a person does when a choice must be made between two things we value (as to be kind and be truthful) in certain situations. In extending comments, another person took the position that the value dilemma was not really a matter of choosing between two values, but of sensing a certain tension between values and not being willing to choose one to the exclusion of the other. Someone else took the position that freedom is found only in the presence of ambiguity, and that the necessity to choose and the possibility of choice are fundamental to freedom. The discussion on value teaching culminated with a brief description of value teaching in pre-literate groups (within children's play groups first; later through a series of adult planned shock treatments--loss of sleep, food, etc.) as contrasted with our approaches to the problem.

The discussion returned to the matter of planning for teaching when one seminar member chose to test the group's thinking by suggesting that the planning sequence should always be from purpose, to organized knowledge, to learning theory and learners. Great issue was not taken with this. It was noted that we cannot put all of our "eggs"

in either the basket of content or the basket of process. Rather, the task is to plan sequences carefully--"stepping stones" and not "leaps" if we do not want to lose children. It was felt that we need to take into account children's present conceptual schemes, and that these need to be "stretched" by other planned learning experiences that provide for the child some degree of extension and/or contrast. Reference was made by the chairman to the concepts of assimilation and accommodation (a time of taking in new material and a time to put it into already present conceptual schemes) from the work of Piaget as being useful in this planning task. The chairman called such planning the development of curriculum strategies. The major goal was seen always as the more complete understanding of the basic ideas to be learned, a few more each year, as the child moves along through school.

At this point Work Session Two was closed and the first day of the working-seminar adjourned.

WORK SESSION THREE

Work Session Three was called to order at 9:00 a.m., Tuesday, July 16, by Professor Richard E. Gross, the session chairman. The first order of business was to conclude, with great reluctance, that the session on teacher education for the social studies should be dropped. It was quite obvious that this was not done because of feelings that this was a matter of little consequence. Rather, the consensus in the group was that this was a large and crucial matter in and of itself calling for a conference limited to teacher education, both pre- and post-service. The seminar group felt that more would be gained in this particular week of discussion if the focus remained more directly on curriculum improvement.

The general focus for this third work session was: Overall Curriculum Planning for the Social Studies. Opening questions were these:

(1) Is an overall design necessary for the social studies?

(2) What approaches are feasible for an overall design?

(3) What options are at the disposal of social studies curriculum planners?

Mr. Gross, the chairman, opened the session by citing four ways to improve the social studies:

(1) Revise and improve the curriculum.

(2) Develop more effective instructional techniques and materials.

(3) Improve the education of teachers.

(4) Utilize new organizational patterns, such as ungraded schools, flexible scheduling, etc.

The point was made that all these paths to improvement need to be utilized; no one can singly do the job. The chairman went on to identify the many forces he saw affecting curriculum in the social studies at this time:

(1) State and local district efforts at improvement.

(2) Efforts centered in individual professors and their doctoral students.

(3) Efforts centered in academic associations and societies.

(4) Efforts centered in the Federal Government.

(5) Efforts centered in private foundations.

(6) Efforts centered in the publishing industry.

(7) Efforts centered in private pressure groups.

He expressed concern over the lack of coordination in these efforts, with the result that they often go in diverse directions. The position was taken that some sort of national center may well be in order to serve:

(1) a clearing house function.

(2) a coordinating function.

(3) an initiating function.

(4) an evaluating function.

At this point the discussion turned more directly to the matter of curriculum design. One seminar member called attention to the polarity of views held on the matter of need for an overall design for the social studies curriculum, noting that these views tend to range from a "class group-teacher centered-emergent" point of view which sees little need for overall design to a "school district-framework centered-planned" point of view which does utilize overall design. This led to discussion of:

(1) the way school districts determine their design.

(2) the extent to which designs are followed.

(3) the extent to which design gives us a necessary point of departure.

The discussion which followed addressed itself in the main to a concern over the premature imposition of an overall design before enough is known about most effective "sequencing" in the social studies program.

One discussant noted that just "a" design is not necessary, but design (some design) can be useful. It was seen as a way to check on the crucial matter of balance in the program. Details in any design, it was felt, can be and will need to be related to local situations and individual classes, but the design does provide a point of departure and a framework for decision making. Centers of organization that leave some choice can be used in designing (that is, designs that do not make mandatory the study of only a particular thing, as a given Latin American nation, a specific industry, etc.). It was stated further that what are badly needed are criteria that would help us to make choices in curriculum designing and that would help us to develop models (plans for thinking about curriculum) showing how we could put the elements together. The models, for instance, would be conceived to (1) insure a minimal mastery of ideas, (2) insure a minimal mastering of intellectual processes, and (3) insure a minimal mastery of certain relevant skills.

At this point, another discussant spoke out for a national center

that would bring personnel together to develop several competitive curriculum designs, clearly different one from the other, complete with materials and guides necessary for their understanding and implementation.

The discussions in the seminar thus far had made it clear that curriculum improvement ventures demand a cooperative effort between social scientists and educators. In light of this, one seminar member recounted the time and effort it took on his campus (in the context of a faculty seminar) before persons from these two university groups really began to talk with each other, and before the total university group could really talk with classroom teachers. This seemed to underscore the need for frequent and lengthy contact between these persons for effective communication.

General discussion led to the conclusion that it is doubtful that any one organizational scheme for knowledge within a curriculum design, be it around social problems, around the disciplines, or what-have-you, will suffice to do the total job. It was evident that the group felt that students in school should undoubtedly have experiences with all of these schemes for learning.

Comments were made on the breadth of learning which the problem orientation, recognizing its built-in interdisciplinary potential, demands of the classroom teacher. That is, teacher and/or children just do not bring to a problem the background that a group of trained social scientists does, and this needs to be kept in mind. The point was made that in the natural sciences problems tend to come from or be associated with one discipline, but social problems tend to call on, for understanding and solution, several of the social disciplines. The earlier mentioned faculty seminar was referred to again at this point. It was noted that in this seminar the "uniqueness" of the several separate social sciences did not become obvious until the group addressed itself to a problem. At this point the several ways of viewing the problem, each related to one of the disciplines, became visible. Thus, this person felt that in a cooperative planning effort the social scientists themselves might be invaluable in helping to develop a synthesis across the social studies as well as identification of material within each discipline.

One social scientist took the position that it may well be up to the social studies curriculum worker to "get out of" each social scientist all that he can, and that the competing projects may be useful in this regard. The need was clearly recognized for a continuing confrontation between social scientists, social studies curriculum workers, learning theorists, etc., if progress is to be made. Some arrangement to provide a chance to work together seemed to be crucial. The need for funds to support continuing centers for such work was indicated. It was felt generally in the seminar group that it will be more difficult to work in the several social sciences areas that are utilized in the social studies than it has been to work in any one field such as mathematics. It was emphasized that such work will call for men of the highest calibre from these social disciplines who will be willing to drop their present scholarly involvements to work on this curriculum

improvement problem, and it was clearly recognized that there are few such people.

The morning session concluded with a somewhat identifiable position on curriculum design emerging which would call for a more coordinated and/or integrated curriculum design for the elementary school years, with more separateness emerging in the secondary school program. However, the related questions and concerns as to the best way to synthesize from several disciplines in a holistic curricular approach and the extent to which separateness in the secondary school curriculum makes unlikely and/or impossible the consideration of material in the "social problem setting" were still very much alive in the seminar.

WORK SESSION FOUR

Work Session Four was called to order at 1:30 p.m., Tuesday, July 16, by Professor Paul Hanna, the session chairman. At the request of the seminar, Mr. Hanna recalled briefly the tenor of the discussion at the close of the morning session. He noted that some in the seminar would seem to support a separate discipline approach as the most useful starting point in curriculum planning and would in fact organize for instruction by separate subject matter area. Others would seem to prefer a unified approach in which the integrity of each of the disciplines was recognized but in which the content of instructional units was developed by drawing from any one or several of the social science disciplines. Further, it was noted that the group saw the unified approach as making more sense in the elementary school, with separateness gaining in favor in the secondary school.

Discussion was also reviewed that had dealt with national planning in curriculum improvement projects in relation to grass roots, local efforts at improvement. The question for consideration seemed to be "What kinds of curriculum decisions are best made by whom?" More specifically, the following questions were asked: (1) What part of the social studies curriculum, if any, is universal (that is, useful in all school systems)? and (2) What part, if any, is local, and how does it become local?

At this time one discussant argued vigorously the point that we may be making nothing but trouble for ourselves by trying to teach economics, anthropology, sociology, and even political science in our schools. Perhaps there should be no social sciences in the curriculum of the elementary school. If any, perhaps history and geography only should be included, dealing essentially with time and space. He argued briefly as to the advisability of including social science in the secondary school program. These comments, of course, caused considerable reaction from other seminar members.

One argued for increased awareness of a state of "readiness" in our time to study social science.

Another argued for anthropology as being perhaps a "catalyst" discipline over both history and geography.

Still another took the position that one of the great obstacles to improvement in the past has been the domination of history in the curriculum, stating that it hasn't worked well as the dominant discipline and should be removed from that position.

Someone else raised the question of the impact of mass media, especially television, on today's children and wondered when we begin to help children to interpret their social experiences.

In rebuttal, the person who raised the point initially said he felt that too much was attempted in the social studies program and that as a result it was "watered down." He would prefer to do less and do it

well; he would prefer time to do a decent job in history and geography. Support came from another member who could not imagine synthesizing in terms other than time or space--and maybe culturally. This same person wondered just how far down in the school structure we should try to get into other social sciences such as economics. There was some tendency to agree with the spirit of the "do less but do it well" point of view but some questioning as to how the "less" which is to be dealt with is to be selected.

At this point, another person entered the discussion to plead persuasively for some why questions to go along with the what and how questions. In other words, a sense of direction or a guiding philosophy loomed as a priority matter in curriculum improvement to this person. He illustrated further by taking the position that most children (and there are many and diverse groups of them) will be consumers of social knowledge, not producers of it. What difference, if any, he asked, does this make in determining the nature of the school curriculum in the social studies? Support came from another for this general position, as attention was called again to skill with social analysis, and comments were made on the "knowledge for what", "education for what" fronts.

At this point, one member tried to bring the focus of the discussion back to the merits of a national center for research and development in the social studies. He noted that to a very great extent: (1) we have a de facto history/geography curriculum, (2) we have a national curriculum via national distribution of textbooks, and (3) we have a very "safe" social studies curriculum. He was very pleased that there was at last real ferment in the social studies. He noted great differences in points of view in this ferment; he noted the need for strong financial support for work in the social studies.

Another member felt that our society would not support any single national center, and felt that too much reliance should not be put on the development of such a center. Somebody else asked what was really meant by the term "national" in this setting. It seemed to him that a number of centers might be more acceptable and that they might develop a wholesome kind of competition.

At this point, the hour to adjourn was fast approaching. It was strongly felt by the seminar members that their time over the next two days would be better spent meeting in small working groups themselves than being observers in small discussion groups in the Cubberley Conference. Two members, however, still wished to do this and they were assigned accordingly to special groups that included the few State Department of Education personnel and social scientists in attendance, along with personnel from selected local school districts. They were to report back on Friday concerning these observed discussion groups. The remaining seminar members were divided equally to form three working groups. Utilizing the two days of discussion already on the record, and aided further by the stimulus of hearing the five major papers to be read in the Cubberley Conference, each of these groups was to spend time Wednesday and Thursday discussing the task of getting on with the job of improvement. More specifically, they

were each to consider the following:

(1) What things need to be done?

(2) What things need to be done first?

(3) What kinds of projects must be carried out?

(4) What research must be undertaken?

(5) Who must be involved?

(6) How might improvement efforts be financed?

To these questions were to be added any others that seemed to be vitally important to any one of the small groups.

Thus Work Session Four was adjourned, with the next full meeting of the seminar group scheduled for Friday morning, July 19.

WORK SESSION FIVE

Work Session Five covered Wednesday and Thursday, July 17 and 18. As agreed, the seminar group was divided for these days into three smaller working groups. These groups met independently over the two days, each committed to the development of a provisional report of recommendations for consideration by the total seminar group on the final day of the week-long seminar.

Seminar members also were present at general sessions on Tuesday evening, July 16, and mornings and afternoons of July 17 and 18 for the presentations of papers to the Cubberley Conference attendees. Papers presented were:

The Social Sciences in the Twentieth Century, by Professor Peter Odegard, Department of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley, California

The Social Studies in the Elementary School in the Twentieth Century, by Professor Paul R. Hanna, School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California

The Social Studies in the Secondary School in the Twentieth Century, by Dean I. James Quillen, School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California

Structure in the Social Sciences and Implications for the Social Studies Curriculum, by Professor Arno Bellack, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York

The Edge of the Future, by Dr. Ralph Tyler, Director, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California

These papers provided additional background information for consideration by the small seminar working groups.

WORK SESSION SIX

Work Session Six, the final working session for the seminar, was called to order on Friday morning, July 19, by the chairman, Professor G. Wesley Sowards. Each of the three small working groups had made a report available on the evening preceding this final session which had contained their provisional recommendations. These reports had been read by the seminar members in anticipation of the morning's discussion. As a further aid to this discussion, Professor Dwight Allen had prepared a rough draft collation of the three separate reports and this was distributed at this time.

The task for this final work session was to reach some group consensus on those things which were seen as crucial for the improvement of the social studies curriculum. The same questions which had guided the work of the smaller groups tended to guide this final session:

(1) What things need to be done?

(2) What things need to be done first?

(3) What kinds of projects must be carried out?

(4) What researches must be undertaken?

(5) Who must be involved?

(6) How might improvement efforts be financed?

What follows are the major conclusions reached by the total seminar group, along with some suggested actions to be taken.

A Concern over Goals

A high priority should be given, it was felt, to efforts to clarify the goals to be sought in and through the social studies program. Lack of understanding as to what the social sciences can do and cannot do weakens the usefulness of some statements of goals. Lack of agreement as to the goals which "make sense" for the social studies takes away from the effectiveness of the program. At many points the deliberations of this working-seminar touched on goals. Concern was expressed to develop competence in social analysis, to teach for values and valuing, and to understand selected social concepts and generalizations. But more direct and complete discussion is called for. Goals to be achieved loom as a major determiner of almost all other matters discussed here. Confusion and/or lack of agreement on goals dissipates and weakens energies and efforts focused on various aspects of the total task of improvement.

Research and Development Projects

It is clear that a great number and variety of research and development projects need to be undertaken in the interests of curriculum

improvement in the social studies. A list is included here which may provoke thought about knowledge needed in this area on the part of persons competent to contribute to it. The seminar group clearly recognizes the very personal nature of the shaping and forming of research efforts. It is not expected that these suggestions will be pursued as such, but they may prove to be suggestive of the broad range of matters which need badly to be studied.

1. A high priority should be given to the application of a sound theory of curriculum development to the preparation of several alternative curriculum designs or models for the social studies, kindergarten through the twelfth grade. Careful study should be given to developing various approaches to the organization of content, to grade placement, and to methods and materials of instruction. Such designs may, for example, range from a curriculum that is unified to one organized along the lines of the separate disciplines.

   Curriculum and instructional guides should be developed along with overall curriculum models so that the spirit or intent of the models will be understood and preserved in their test. Instruments for evaluation which purport to measure or give evidence of pupil progress toward goals to which the model is oriented should be developed as an integral part of each project.

   As these are developed, research should be conducted within the context of at least two curriculum models so that a comparison might be made to determine the effectiveness of these designs.

2. A study should be made of the kinds of modifications which might be necessary in social studies programs (alternatives in content and/or process) with respect to:

   a. Different ability levels of students.

   b. Differing cultural backgrounds of students, especially the so-called "disadvantaged" groups.

3. Research is needed focused on the study of teaching strategies, below the level of curriculum and instructional guides. A great deal more must be known about the general effectiveness of a variety of instructional processes used in the social studies, for both cognitive and affective learning outcomes. Specifically, knowledge is needed as to their effectiveness with particular groups of pupils (age, socio-economic groupings, etc.) and in relation to a particular social science area.

4. Research should be initiated focused on the social sciences, as such, to determine ways in which each of the social sciences can best contribute to the social studies program.

   a. The basic ideas and/or concepts of each of the social sciences need to be identified.

b. Analysis of the structure (methods and concepts) of each social science discipline is needed to determine the relationships of each to the structures of the other social science disciplines.

As social scientists study their disciplines in order to make available to the curriculum worker elements from them for refreshing and strengthening the program, criteria for selection are important. The following are suggestive of what these criteria might be:

a. An "analytical tool", of value for understanding at the highest level of scholarship, which can be converted with full honesty into equivalent and suitable form for each level of the schools and utilized as early as in actual experience we find students satisfyingly and fruitfully grasping it.

b. An issue, on which thoughtful people would divide into earnest yeses and earnest noes, so that the teacher will be under least possible temptation to "tell" the students what they should conclude but instead feel encouraged to have them walk the knife-edge of searching inquiry, which should steadily help them to deeper and wider understanding.

c. A fruitful as well as widely applicable concept, fruitful in the sense of assisting the student to understand other central concepts in their difficult but essential aspects.

5. Studies are needed concerned with the emotional block to the learning of concepts in the social studies. It would appear that knowledge from the social sciences has difficulty in gaining ascendance over the "common sense" of the learner.

Bruner's studies of concept attainment deal largely with the attainment of non-verbal concepts in a clinical environment. The translation of his findings into classroom handling of the verbal concepts which predominate in the social studies has not been made, and may not be possible. Direct experimentation in the classroom is necessary to the identification of strategies by which to:

a. Teach concepts, and

b. Ascertain whether concepts have been mastered by learners.

This research would be based upon the assumption that the political, economic, social, and other beliefs of the learner are not always consistent with the concepts and propositions of social science, and that there is a tendency for individuals to reject out-of-hand content that seems to insult or attack their personal belief structure.

6. Studies are needed on children's concepts of and attitudes toward economic, social, and other human problems, similar to the study undertaken by Easton and Hess in the area of political science.

7. Studies are called for on the processes of thinking, especially in relation to the ways in which these processes function and methods appropriate for their development.

8. The readiness of children in the primary grades to undertake social studies experiences needs to be examined. It is necessary to know whether children of these ages can learn social concepts, and to determine whether they need to do so in these early school years.

9. Comparative studies should be made of classroom groups which demonstrate interest in social studies and groups which do not to identify the correlates of each.

10. There is a need for greater research into the effectiveness of teaching certain concepts (e.g., temporal and spatial relationships) which are presently incorporated in social studies programs. Present studies are largely eclectic and a synthesis of their findings should be attempted.

Teacher Education

This group would like to call attention to the cruciality of teacher education in this whole matter of improvement in the social studies. Earlier in this report it was noted that the seminar work session on teacher education was dropped, with the feeling expressed that this area called for a week-long working-seminar itself. For teachers, through whom curriculum becomes a living reality, the need for new and more widely distributed capabilities is critical.

Teachers of the new social studies will need to understand the principles of curriculum design in the emerging program with which they become concerned. They will need to grasp the major themes and concepts around which the new curriculum is organized and to understand the essential structure of the fields of social science which will contribute to curriculum patterns of the future. Teachers will need to understand the selection of appropriate illustrative content and will need increasing creative skill in handling and developing teaching strategies and evaluation procedures which will maximize inductive learning. They also will need to be able to use insights into human development that derive from studies of children and youth.

The upgrading of the social studies curriculum is ultimately dependent on teachers who can bring intelligence, humane values, literacy in the content fields of history and the social sciences, and a lively inventiveness to the act of teaching. Innovations currently underway in teacher education, both pre- and in-service (experimental graduate programs, summer institutes, television programs, etc.), are to be encouraged and still

others are to be hoped for. Such innovations must not become preoccupied with questions of "form" for teacher education, as questions of "substance" are crucial, too.

School Reorganization

It will behoove all who aspire to an improved social studies program to keep informed of change in the utilization of staff, space, and time in the school, too. Innovation here may make possible innovation in the ordering and "packaging" of the social studies program.

Arrangements for Communication and Cooperation

It is obvious that the process of curriculum development for an improved social studies program embraces very legitimate roles for several kinds of people. Clearly, scholars from the various social sciences and from history must be involved. So, too, must the professional educator, defined to include the educational psychologist and sociologist, the curriculum specialist, and the classroom teacher, be involved. And, at particular times for particular purposes the layman, too, must be included. What is demanded is, essentially, a team-work approach. Ideally, social scientists provide subject matter, educators design and teach, and laymen provide popular support for and public approval of curricula. Actually, the three rarely get together. It is this which must be recognized and surmounted. Simultaneous involvement need not always be undertaken, but constant communication among these groups is a necessary condition to effective innovation and improvement for the social studies. Obviously, educators and social scientists need to meet often enough and long enough each time to establish personal contacts and mutual understanding. Many attempts to revise, update, and otherwise improve the social studies are imperative to gain the continuing interest of the social scientists and to maintain and extend current cooperative efforts between social scientists, professional educators, and certain concerned laymen. Channels of communication should be institutionalized so that leaders in these fields can work together over extended periods of time in mutual projects.

1. Centers should be established for research and development in the social studies, supporting activities concerned with both curriculum development and instructional improvement. Such centers, based on the pattern of centers now in existence for the natural and behavioral sciences, would provide for a more lengthy and intimate contact between social scientists and educators. At such centers individuals could collaborate on the creation of curriculum development projects, material evaluation projects, generalization-identifying projects, and other such efforts that call for planning and staffing by personnel from these fields. Center programs might also evolve steps that will involve professional educators in the academic societies and social scientists in the activities of educational associations. The structure of such centers should be kept as informal as possible, without opportunity for empire building.

Service in such a center should be voluntary and flexible, with compensation sufficient so as not to become a personal sacrifice for anyone. A minimum full-time staff should be included at each center, with a director. A small executive committee of educators, social scientists, and laymen might well be associated with each such center. Such centers should not become a branch of the government, of an academic institution, or a simple commercial interest. Neither should they be under the control of any national academic or professional association or combination thereof.

In the interest of maintaining balance in the school curriculum, these centers should maintain close communication between themselves, and establish continuing liaison with similar centers concerned with areas of the curriculum other than the social studies.

2. The establishment of several continuing seminars, possibly on a regional basis, where educators and social scientists could hold joint sessions on topics and problems of common concern should be considered.

Such seminar meetings would require: places, times, schedules, a selection of personnel, structure, and finance. The location of each meeting place for such a seminar matters little with every part of the United States within five hours' flying time. Comfort, freedom from distraction, and escape when needed would be prime considerations; at times the availability of special equipment would be important. Seminar agenda and schedules should be carefully planned to eliminate irrelevant talk and to save time. There should be, it would seem, one to three members from each major branch of social science and from history, and a number of educators in attendance at each seminar meeting, with some plan for the rotation of personnel over a period of time.

3. Provisions should be made within each of the social science professional associations for the establishment of permanent committees on education. Among their purposes could be:

    a. Maintaining communication with national groups (i.e., the National Academy of Sciences) so that a coordination of intra-disciplinary group activities would be centralized.

    b. Preparing papers concerning the development of the structures of the social sciences.

    c. Preparing bibliographies of relevant researches.

    d. Reviewing publications in each of the social sciences.

4. Large local school districts, or combinations of smaller ones, should be encouraged to undertake appropriate research and

development ventures themselves, and to maintain lines of communication with regional centers for cooperative possibilities for profitable research undertaking.

5. The group concluded, also, that there is immediate need for increased fact-finding and extended information distribution activities in the field of the social studies. While a social studies center could be created to accomplish this, an established agency such as the U.S. Office of Education that has served this function in the past might be most appropriate. However, it will need increased funds and staff to carry out the extensive and rapid action required. Data need to be gathered on many fronts; student populations, social studies offerings and requirements, course patterning, time allotments, teacher qualifications, and other items that will provide a more complete and accurate picture of conditions in the schools.

   This agency or center should also categorize, digest, and disseminate data, serving as a national clearing house for reporting the results of the many projects and increasing amount of research being carried on. There is now no single source for complete information to which teachers, authors, curriculum workers, administrators, and others interested, can turn for timely information on social studies curriculum and instruction.

Financial Support

That finance is a key element in curriculum improvement in the area of the social studies, as it has been in other areas, is apparent.

The group felt that a general effort, from the local to the national level, is needed to provide adequate financial support in curriculum and instructional improvement in the social studies. Progressively greater financial support should be obtained as larger agencies and foundations become involved.

1. Federal and private foundational support should be sought.

2. State departments of education should provide financial support for improving social studies programs.

3. Colleges and universities should provide continued financial support for research and development in the social studies.

4. Industries which are involved in producing educational materials have vested interest in improved social studies materials. Monies should be provided by them for research, design, and development of social studies programs.

5. Associations, both within the social sciences and in education, should provide funds for research, design, and development of social studies programs.

6. It was noted that local school districts are limited financially, as well as in human resources, to engage effectively in a detailed improvement of the social studies. It was felt that they should be urged to set aside at least one percent of their budgets for research and development. This could be supplemented by special grants to school systems to encourage active programs of instructional improvement at the building or system level. Such programs might include summer workshops for staff, provision for paid consultant scholars to work with teachers in such workshops, provision for training materials, and provision for the annual appointment of visiting scholars in residence.